## APPEAL NO. 032086 FILED SEPTEMBER 11, 2003

This appeal arises pursuant to the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, TEX. LAB. CODE ANN. § 401.001 *et seq.* (1989 Act). A contested case hearing was held on July 24, 2003. The hearing officer determined that the appellant (claimant) did not sustain a compensable injury in the form of an occupational disease and had no disability. The claimant appeals the compensable injury and disability determinations, arguing that the determinations are in error. The respondent (carrier) urges affirmance.

## **DECISION**

Affirmed.

The claimant contended that she sustained a repetitive trauma injury from performing her work activities taking care of patients in a child health clinic operated by the (employer) and that she has had disability as a result of that injury. The claimant had the burden to prove that she sustained a repetitive trauma injury as defined by Section 401.011(36) and that she has had disability as defined by Section 401.011(16). There was conflicting evidence presented with regard to this issue. The hearing officer is the sole judge of the weight and credibility of the evidence (Section 410.165(a)) and, as the trier of fact, resolves the conflicts and inconsistencies in the evidence, including the medical evidence (Texas Employers Insurance Association v. Campos, 666 S.W.2d 286 (Tex. App.-Houston [14th Dist.] 1984, no writ)). Although the hearing officer found the claimant credible, he was not persuaded that the evidence showed that the claimant was engaged in repetitious or physically traumatic activity at work. The hearing officer's determination is not so against the great weight and preponderance of the evidence as to be clearly wrong or manifestly unjust. Cain v. Bain, 709 S.W.2d 175 (Tex. 1986).

The 1989 Act requires the existence of a compensable injury as a prerequisite to a finding of disability. Section 401.011(16). Because the claimant did not sustain a compensable injury, the hearing officer properly concluded that the claimant did not have disability.

The decision and order of the hearing officer are affirmed.

The true corporate name of the insurance carrier is (a self-insured governmental entity) and the name and address of its registered agent for service of process is

(NAME) (ADDRESS) (CITY), TEXAS (ZIP CODE).

	Thomas A. k Appeals Jud
CONCUR:	
Robert W. Potts	
Appeals Judge	
Edward Vilano	
Appeals Judge	